



Civil Service Commission Meeting
Wednesday, March 25, 2026, at 3:00 PM

City Council Chambers, City Hall (10 3rd Ave SW)

Any person needing special accommodation for the meeting is requested to notify the
City Clerk's office at 857-4752.

1. ROLL CALL

2. POLICE DEPARTMENT ASSESSMENT CENTER

2.1. POLICE DEPARTMENT ASSESSMENT CENTER - LIEUTENANT &
CAPTAIN

**It is recommended Civil Service review and approve the proposed new
Assessment Center Testing Procedures for Lieutenant and Captain.**

3. QUARTER 1 2026 EMPLOYMENT LISTS

3.1. RATIFICATION OF 1ST QUARTER 2026 EMPLOYMENT LISTS

**It is recommended Civil Service ratify the administratively approved
Quarter 1 2026 employment lists.**

4. ADJOURNMENT

MINOT POLICE DEPARTMENT

PROMOTIONAL PROCESS

Thank you for your application to participate in the “***Fair and Transparent Assessment-Based Promotional Process***” for the position of with the Minot Police Department. The pages to follow are a description of the details regarding this promotional process. Please read the following pages and, when you have a clear understanding of the process, sign below to acknowledge.

Thank you, and good luck!!!

APPLICANT PRINTED NAME

APPLICANT SIGNATURE

DATE

MINOT POLICE DEPARTMENT

A Fair and Transparent Assessment-Based Promotional Process

	<i>Years of Service, Training Hours, and Education</i>	<i>Formal Interview</i>	<i>Scenario's</i>	<i>Topical Presentation</i>	<i>Program Implementation</i>
<i>Sgt.</i>	x	x	x		
<i>Lt.</i>	x	x	x	x	
<i>Capt.</i>	x	x	x	x	x

1. Years of Service, Training Hours, and Education

Each candidate will be given three percentages, one based on years of service, one based on training hours, and one based on education. In addition, candidates who test for the rank of Captain will be given a score (out of 100 total) based upon their current rank. Sergeants who test for the rank of Captain will receive a score of 75 and Lieutenants who test for the rank of Captain will receive a score of 100 to account for current rank. These percentages will be averaged (all scores will be rounded to 2 decimal points) to produce a score out of one hundred points for that candidate with 100 being the highest and 0 being the lowest. The percentages will vary based on which promotional position the candidate is applying for. The numbers are as follows:

	Rank	Years of Service	POST Training	Education
Sgt.	N/A	% out of 10 years max	% out of 1400 hours max	% out of 128 credit hours (undergraduate max)
Lt.	N/A	% out of 15 years max	% out of 1700 hours max	% out of 158 credit hours (128 undergraduate max + 30 graduate)
Capt.	Sgt= 75 Lt = 100	% out of 20 years max	% out of 2000 hours max	% out of 188 credit hours (128 undergraduate max + 60 graduate)

- Transcripts must be provided for credit hours
- 128 credit hours are based on ND Board of Higher Education standard for a Bachelors degree.
- Credit for in-state or out-of-state Law Enforcement Skills Program (Academy) will be considered on a case-by-case basis not to exceed the total NDPOST hours allowed for NDLETA. 440 credits given for out of state academy.

2. Formal Interview

The candidates will sit in front of a three-person interview panel (the panel will consist of individuals at the discretion of the Chief of Police) and be asked a series of questions from a predetermined list. Each panelist will score each question on a sliding scale totaling 100 points with 100 being the best and 0 being the worst. The three panelists' scores will then be averaged (all scores will be rounded to 2 decimal points) to produce one average score out of one hundred points for that

candidate. The questions will remain the same for each candidate in this promotion cycle, and the three panelists must also remain the same.

- May be the same day or different day as other portions of testing (depending on time and # of applicants)
- Consists of PD employee, City employee, non-city employee interview panel

3. Scenario's

The candidates will address a three-person panel (the panel will consist of individuals at the discretion of the Chief of Police) and be given a scenario they will be required to work through. Sergeant candidates will be required to complete a total of three scenarios with three separate panels. Lieutenant Candidates will be required to complete one higher level scenario which is applicable to their rank and job duties. Captain Candidates will be required to complete one high level scenario which is applicable to their rank and job duties. Each scenario will reflect the duties or requirements of the position. The scenarios will remain the same for each candidate in the promotion cycle, and the three panelists must also remain the same. Each panelist will score each scenario on a sliding scale one through fifty, with fifty being the best and one being the worst. The three panelists' scores will then be averaged (all decimal points will be rounded down) to produce one average score out of 50 points for that scenario. The three individual averaged scores from the scenario's will then be averaged and a percentage will be formulated based upon a total possible score of 150. This percentage will be multiplied to provide a final scoring out of 100 maximum.

Topical Presentation

The candidates will be given a topical police issue/topic and be asked to give a presentation about that issue/topic. The candidates will be given a specific and limited amount of time to prepare for their presentation. (Ideally candidates would be given the issue/topic in the morning and give the presentation that afternoon). Candidates would give the presentations to a three-person panel (the panel will consist of individuals at the discretion of the Chief of Police) and each panelist would then score the candidate's presentation on a sliding scale from one to one hundred, with 100 being the best and one being the worst. The three panelists' scores will then be averaged (all decimal points will be rounded down) to produce one average score out of one hundred points for that candidate. The topic/issue will remain the same for each candidate in this promotion cycle, and the three panelists must also remain the same.

Program Implementation

The candidates will be given specific program and/or system that could be changed/implemented at the Minot Police Department. The candidates will be required to write a full plan to change/implement this specific program/system. Plans would be required to include how and why the change is taking place, a plan to rollout the program/system to the entire PD, pre and post system/program rollout plans, and possible pitfalls that might need to be addressed along the way. Candidates would present these plans to the same three-person panel (the panel will consist of individuals at the discretion of the Chief of Police) as during the Topical Presentation. Each panelist would then be able to ask questions and the candidate would have to defend their plan. At the conclusion each candidate would score the candidate's plan on a sliding scale from one to one hundred, with 100 being the best and one being the worst. The three panelists' scores will then be averaged (all decimal points will be rounded to the nearest 1/100th of a percent) to produce one average score out of

one hundred points for that candidate. The program/system will remain the same for each candidate in this promotion cycle, and the three panelists must also remain the same.

Final Cumulative Assessment Score

The candidates final score is the cumulative average of each phase of the assessment process for the respective rank (all decimal points being rounded down). Sgt. candidates scores would take the average of the scores from sections 1-3 listed above (Service Points, Interview, and Scenarios). Lieutenants candidate scores would derive from sections 1-4 listed above (Service points, Interview, (1) Lieutenant level scenario, and Topical Presentation). Captain's candidate scores will be derived from the Service Points, Interview, (1) Captain level scenario, Topical Presentation, and Program Implementation Presentation.

Promotional Decision

Based upon the outcome of the Assessment Center process, the Chief of Police will select an applicant from any of the top three candidates (per civil service guidelines). This will take into effect the scoring of the Assessment Center process, job related experience, available position, and other factors not considered in the testing process.

City Manager Approval

The Chief of Police will forward his promotional choice to the City Manager for final approval. Once this approval has been obtained, the promotion will be sent to H.R. to upgrade the applicants' rank and pay in the payroll system.

LIEUTENANT'S ASSESSMENT CENTER POTENTIAL CHANGE

Rather than three scenario's that involve the day-to-day work of a Lieutenant, they would have one scenario that deals with an executive level issue that effects an entire division or section of the police department.

Scenario examples:

- Budgetary request that a Budget Amendment would be required
- Equipment purchase request and rollout
- Staffing adjustment that would require changes to the organizational chart and defense.
- Press conference involving incident.

- Panel could consist of:
 - City Manager
 - Retired or Current Council Member
 - Retired police chief (ie- Jason Olson, Jeff Balentine, etc)
 - Business executive or CFO

CAPTAIN'S ASSESSMENT CENTER POTENTIAL CHANGE

Rather than three scenario's that involve the day-to-day work of a Captain, they would have one scenario that was at a high level and provided them an opportunity to deal with issues that are at a department-wide level.

Scenario examples:

- Budget amendment defense in front of council (mock council)
- High level media press conference
- High level incident management

- Panel could consist of:
 - City Manager
 - Retired or Current Council Member
 - Retired police chief (ie- Jason Olson, Jeff Balentine, etc)
 - Business executive or CFO

**Assistant City Attorney
January 2026**

	100				100 Points	
	(320 x .3125)					
Name	Interview rs	Interview CS	Vet Pref-%	Vet Pref Points	Total	Placement
Terrence Wallace	275.5	86.0938		0.00	86.09	1
Alexander Moreta	197.00	61.5625		0.00	61.56	2

RS = Raw Score

CS = Converted Score

* = no interview score

Building Grounds Worker Sr
January 2026

		45 points		45 points		10 points	100 points	
		(82 x .5487)		(300 x .15)				
Name	Test RS	Test CS	Interview RS	Interview CS	Service Time	Service Time Points	Total	Placement
Matthew Oswalt	0	0.0000	0.00	0.0000	4yr10day	5	5.0000	NA
Andrew Dyson	70	38.4090	0.00	0.0000	4mo6day	1	39.4090	1

RS = Raw Score
CS = Converted Score

Finance Manager- Feb 2026

		45 points		45 points		10 points	100 points	
		(40 x 1.125)		(300 x .15)				
Name	Test RS	Test CS	Interview RS	Interview CS	Service Time	Service Time Points	Total	Placement
Callie Burns	35	39.38	0.00	0.0000	9yrs	9	48.3750	1
Brittany Shefstad	32	36.00	0.00	0.0000	3yrs6mo	3	39.0000	2

RS = Raw Score

CS = Converted Score

Heavy Equipment Operator
March 2026

		(90 x .55555)		(300 x .1666)					
		50 points		50 points				100 points	
Name	Test RS	Test CS	Interview RS	Interview CS	Subtotal	Vet Pref %	Vet Pref Points	Total	Placement
Wesley Paternoster	67	37.2219	223.20	37.1851	74.4070	10.00%	7.4407	81.8477	1
Henry Wade	64	35.5552	244.30	40.7004	76.2556		0.0000	76.2556	2
Michael Alfonse	58	32.2219	250.80	41.7833	74.0052		0.0000	74.0052	3
Christopher Turner	52	28.8886	213.35	35.5441	64.4327		0.0000	64.4327	4
Lance Racine	62	34.4441	163.40	27.2224	61.6665		0.0000	61.6665	5

RS = Raw Score

CS = Converted Score

* = using previous test score

Heavy Equipment Operator- January 2026

		45 points		45 points		10 points	100 points	
		(90 x .50)		(300 x .15)				
Name	Test RS	Test CS	Interview RS	Interview CS	Service Time	Service Time Points	Total	Placement
Mark Mathwich	65	32.50	225.6	33.8400	4mo	0	66.3400	1
Joseph Mennem	63	31.50	228.7	34.3050	4mo	0	65.8050	2
Jimmy Boyett	63	31.50	207.3	31.0950	1wk 2days	0	62.5950	3
Brooke MacKay	46	23.00	209.20	31.3800	7yr5mo	7	61.3800	4
Zach Petty	44	22.00	228.4	34.2600	4mo	0	56.2600	5
Richard Gruse	54	27.00	171.85	25.7775	2yr7mo	2	54.7775	6
Ronald Archer	49	24.50	148.55	22.2825	1yr2mo	1	47.7825	7
Dustin Anderson	57	28.50	92.85	13.9275	1yr8mo	1	43.4275	8
Cole Zietz	0	0.00	0.00	0.0000	7yr9mo	7	7.0000	

RS = Raw Score

CS = Converted Score

Law Enforcement Office Specialist- Feb 2026

			50 points		50 points				100 points	
			(118 x .4237)		(300 x .1666)					
Last Name	First Name	Test RS	Test CS	Interview RS	Interview CS	Subtotal	Vet Pref%	Vet Pref Points	Total	Placement
Ciak	Crystal	99	41.95	231	38.4846	80.43		0.00	80.43	1
Molloy	Lizz	100	42.37	219.00	36.4854	78.86		0.00	78.86	2
Hough	Elena	88	37.29	212	35.3192	72.60	5%	3.63	76.24	3
Sorensen	Beth	93	39.40	209	34.8194	74.22		0.00	74.22	4
Hurt	Jenna	81	34.32	229	38.1514	72.47		0.00	72.47	5
Cooper	Kassandra	87	36.86	179.00	29.8214	66.68		0.00	66.68	6
Schwager	Christi	65	27.54	181	30.1546	57.70		0.00	57.70	7
Struksnes	Miranda	66	27.96	175.00	29.1550	57.12		0.00	57.12	8
Permentier	Yves	92	38.98		0.0000	38.98		0.00	38.98	
Gantzer	Shelby	87	36.86		0.0000	36.86		0.00	36.86	
Knight	Ben	76	32.20		0.0000	32.20		0.00	32.20	
Lilly	Amy	65	27.54		0.0000	27.54		0.00	27.54	
Greek	Christopher	59	25.00		0.0000	25.00	10%	2.50	27.50	
Rivers	Krystal	62	26.27		0.0000	26.27		0.00	26.27	
Edmundson-Shook	Rachael	61	25.85		0.0000	25.85		0.00	25.85	
McCoy	Janette	59	25.00		0.0000	25.00		0.00	25.00	
Sem	Lana	57	24.15		0.0000	24.15		0.00	24.15	
Morales Ramos	Adriana	54	22.88		0.0000	22.88		0.00	22.88	
McCallum	Joseph	44	18.64		0.0000	18.64	10.00%	1.86	20.51	
Bryson	Joshua	48	20.34		0.0000	20.34		0.00	20.34	
Morin	Stone	46	19.49		0.0000	19.49		0.00	19.49	

RS = Raw Score

CS = Converted Score

* = no interview score

**Utility Operator
February 2026**

	100				100 Points	
	(300 x .3333)					
Name	Interview rs	Interview CS	Vet Pref-%	Vet Pref Points	Total	Placement
Joshua Dawson	232.1	77.3589	5%	3.87	81.23	1
Steven Geiser	233.15	77.7089		0.00	77.71	2
Christopher Turner	215	71.6595		0.00	71.66	3
Trevor Enget	202.95	67.6432		0.00	67.64	4
Elliott Oxford	191.15	63.7103	5%	3.19	66.90	5
Christopher Mescia	178.5	59.4941	10%	5.95	65.44	6
Michael Persinger	174.40	58.1275	10%	5.81	63.94	7
Ryan Schlaepfer	180.65	60.2106	5%	3.01	63.22	8
Casey Gibson	0	0.0000	5%	0.00	0.00	NA

RS = Raw Score

CS = Converted Score

* = no interview score

Utility Operator, Lead
January 2026

		45 points		45 points		10 points	100 points	
		(104 x .4326)		(300 x .15)				
Name	Test RS	Test CS	Interview RS	Interview CS	Service Time	Service Time Points	Total	Placement
Derek Robinson	76	32.8776	0.00	0.0000	9yr4mo	10	42.8776	1
Carson Bergrude	73	31.5798	0.00	0.0000	2yr5mo	3	34.5798	2
James Rice	74	32.0124	0.00	0.0000	6mo	1	33.0124	3

RS = Raw Score

CS = Converted Score

Water Plant Operator I
March 2026

			(43 x 1.1627)		(300 x .1666)					
			50 points		50 points				100 points	
Last Name	First Name	Test RS	Test CS	Interview RS	Interview CS	Subtotal	Vet Pref %	Vet Pref Points	Total	Placement
Craig	James	30.00	34.8810	228.05	37.9931	72.8741	5.00%	3.6437	76.5178	1
Johnson	Jared	33.00	38.3691	226.15	37.6766	76.0457		0.0000	76.0457	2
Garcia Perez	Enrique	41.00	47.6707	155.9	25.9729	73.6436		0.0000	73.6436	3
Paul Sano	Meljun	29.00	33.7183	223.85	37.2934	71.0117		0.0000	71.0117	4
O'Neil	Mason	25.00	29.0675	171.2	28.5219	57.5894	5.00%	2.8795	60.4689	5
Carmelo-Rose	Travis	26.00	30.2302	180.2	30.0213	60.2515		0.0000	60.2515	6
Schumaier	Jared	26.00	30.2302	164.60	27.4224	57.6526		0.0000	57.6526	7
Micke	Jeffrey	34.00	39.5318	94.4	15.7270	55.2588		0.0000	55.2588	8
Fulton	Gage	27.00	31.3929	132.3	22.0412	53.4341		0.0000	53.4341	9
Sheneman	Cody	35.00	40.6945		0.0000	40.6945		0.0000	40.6945	
Mathis	Daniel	27.00	31.3929		0.0000	31.3929	10.00%	3.1393	34.5322	
Schneider	Preston	26.00	30.2302		0.0000	30.2302		0.0000	30.2302	
Arias	Christian	26.00	30.2302		0.0000	30.2302		0.0000	30.2302	
Heil	Travis	25.00	29.0675		0.0000	29.0675		0.0000	29.0675	
Rice	Brian	24.00	27.9048		0.0000	27.9048		0.0000	27.9048	
Vetter	Nathan	24.00	27.9048		0.0000	27.9048		0.0000	27.9048	
Pacovsky	Jacob	23.00	26.7421		0.0000	26.7421		0.0000	26.7421	
Lewis	Emma	23.00	26.7421		0.0000	26.7421		0.0000	26.7421	
Eckel	Joshua	22.00	25.5794		0.0000	25.5794		0.0000	25.5794	
Wade	Henry	22.00	25.5794		0.0000	25.5794		0.0000	25.5794	
Byers	Charles	20.00	23.2540		0.0000	23.2540	10.00%	2.3254	25.5794	
DePriest	Austin	21.00	24.4167		0.0000	24.4167		0.0000	24.4167	
Boykin	Rufus	21.00	24.4167		0.0000	24.4167		0.0000	24.4167	
Skalicky	Troy	20.00	23.2540		0.0000	23.2540		0.0000	23.2540	
Wolf	Tasha	19.00	22.0913		0.0000	22.0913		0.0000	22.0913	
Johnson	Evan	12.00	13.9524		0.0000	13.9524		0.0000	13.9524	
Zizumbo	Daniel	6.00	6.9762		0.0000	6.9762		0.0000	6.9762	

RS = Raw Score

CS = Converted Score

*** = using previous test score**

Water Plant Operator I
March 2026

Cantone	Kaden	5.00	5.8135		0.0000	5.8135		0.0000	5.8135	
Neer	Shawn	3.00	3.4881		0.0000	3.4881		0.0000	3.4881	

RS = Raw Score

CS = Converted Score

* = using previous test score

Water Wastewater Foreman Feb 2026

		45 points		45 points		10 points	100 points	
		(100 x .45)		(300 x .15)				
Name	Test RS	Test CS	Interview RS	Interview CS	Service Time	Service Time Points	Total	Placement
Scot Knoop	75	33.75	0	0.0000	12yr10mo	10	43.7500	1
Cory Burnley	82	36.90	0	0.0000	2yr7mo	2	38.9000	2

RS = Raw Score

CS = Converted Score

WTP Superintendent- Feb 2026

		45 points		45 points		10 points	100 points	
		(40 x 1.125)		(300 x .15)				
Name	Test RS	Test CS	Interview RS	Interview CS	Service Time	Service Time Points	Total	Placement
Collin Kittelson	34	38.25	0.00	0.0000	7yrs	7	45.2500	1
James Walker	36	40.50	0.00	0.0000	4yrs9mo	4	44.5000	2
Justin Seifert	30	33.75	0.00	0.0000	25yr1mo	10	43.7500	3

RS = Raw Score

CS = Converted Score

	1							2				3												4				RANK	
Name	Service	Service % (100% Max)	Training	Training % (100% max)	Education	% (100% max)	Avg %	Int 1 Total 100 pts	Int 2 Total 100 pts	Int 3 Total 100 pts	Avg	Scenario 1 Scores (100 total points)				Avg	Scenario 2 Scores Counselling (100 total points)				Avg	Scenario 3 Scores Public (100 total points)		Dealing with (100 total points)		Avg	Total Scenario Avg %		Cumulative Score
Column2	Column3	Column4	Column5	Column6	Column7	Column8	Column9	Column10	Column11	Column12	Column13	Column14	Column15	Column16	Column17	Column18	Column19	Column20	Column21	Column22	Column23	Column24	Column25	Column26	Column27	Column28	Column29		
Roach	9.79	97.90%	1470	100.00%	118	92.19%	96.70	65	80	74	73	88	91	84	87.66666667	78	67	84	76.33333333	88	84	79	83.66666667	82.56	252.25	84.0837963	1		
Washington	11.94	100.00%	1905	100.00%	83.5	65.23%	88.41	69	72	74	71.66666667	89	88	85	87.33333333	86	79	78	81	89	93	81	87.66666667	85.33	245.41	81.8038194	2		
Guerton	9.79	97.90%	1334	95.29%	188	100.00%	97.73	66	74	66	68.66666667	69	65	72	68.66666667	96	78	85	86.33333333	85	82	75	80.66666667	78.56	244.95	81.6502646	3		
Reis	7.38	73.80%	956	68.29%	123	96.09%	79.39	70	86	81	79	79	90	84	84.33333333	98	81	90	89.66666667	83	88	74	81.66666667	85.22	243.62	81.2051257	4		
Pollman	10.54	100.00%	1320	94.29%	151.5	100.00%	98.10	71	73	67	70.33333333	69	65	73	69	64	60	59	61	77	88	75	80	70.00	238.43	79.4761905	5		
Carter	9.35	93.50%	1800	100.00%	55.5	43.36%	78.95	68	84	81	77.66666667	85	81	81	82.33333333	96	70	87	84.33333333	80	79	73	77.33333333	81.33	237.95	79.3177083	6		
Myers	7.11	71.10%	1085	77.50%	120	92.75%	80.78	67	83	70	73.33333333	78	72	76	75.33333333	88	82	72	80.66666667	82	86	69	79	78.33	232.45	77.4833333	7		
Miller, Gannon	5.76	57.60%	1205	86.07%	129	100.00%	81.22	65	74	64	67.66666667	79	87	78	81.33333333	96	68	86	83.33333333	82	90	73	81.66666667	82.11	231.00	77.0005291	8		
DeNovio	5.92	59.20%	996	71.14%	81	63.28%	64.54	68	76	72	72	84	89	86	86.33333333	88	67	79	78	86	79	69	78	80.78	217.32	72.4397156	9		
Williams	9.58	95.80%	1030	73.57%	23	17.97%	62.45	71	73	69	71	75	78	82	78.33333333	80	65	76	73.66666667	78	85	68	77	76.33	209.78	69.9266865	10		
Presley	5.77	57.70%	630	45.00%	83	64.84%	55.85	69	78	77	74.66666667	67	64	69	66.66666667	82	62	83	75.66666667	85	91	70	82	74.78	205.29	68.430787	11		
Miller, Cody	5.59	55.90%	1228	87.71%	20	15.63%	53.08	66	76	68	70	67	60	72	66.33333333	92	69	74	78.33333333	82	91	78	83.66666667	76.11	199.19	66.3969577	12		
Connole	7.05	70.50%	1850	100.00%	0	0.00%	56.83	70	70	70	70	55	56	49	53.33333333	64	62	72	66	81	84	65	76.66666667	65.33	192.17	64.0555556	13		